



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

The *editio princeps* of the *Persians* of *Timotheos* (New York, Lemcke and Büchner) is just now a topic of absorbing interest to all Hellenists (A. J. P. XXIV 110) and I will make no apology to the readers of the *Journal* for postponing to a calmer day other matter intended for the *Brief Mention* of this number. Unless I say what is on my mind now, I shall be shamed out of my impressionism; for I remember what Haussoullier said about the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* (A. J. P. XII 97), and recall my own experience with Herondas and Bakchylides. Three months hence it will be impossible to make the slightest observation about *Timotheos*, without consulting all the dreary literature, all the journals, all the programmes. Three months hence I shall have lost all desire to say anything about this treasure-trove. The air will be filled with the shouts of scholars claiming recognition *ὄξυπαρανδήτῳ φωνᾷ παρακόπῳ τε δόξα φρενῶν* and there will be no room for my obviousnesses. Perhaps I shall repent then of what I have to say now; for *αἱ δεῦτεραί πως φροντίδες σοφώτεραι*. But the old saw is only partly true. The first impression made by a work of art is distinctly precious and is often worth more than the results of painful excogitation. The more one meditates, the more one is apt to sophisticate oneself. At all events I am going to set down certain things that forced themselves on me during the early hours of my acquaintance with this remarkable document. Early hours, I say, because little more than a day intervened between my first reading of the text as it appeared in the *Independent* of April 9, copied from the facsimile edition, and the arrival of the annotated edition, when the potent influence of WILAMOWITZ made itself felt. True, it had made itself felt already in the restorations that had been silently incorporated in the text; and the virginity of the eye was lost forever, *nulla reparabilis arte*. Still in the untroubled interval I had studied the piece for myself and some of those first impressions that have been confirmed by subsequent reflections may be worth the space I shall give them. The *editio princeps* of any such fragment is apt to be an *editio praeceps* and my unfeigned admiration for the learning and insight of the eminent editor has not blinded me to the hastinesses of his edition nor will it prevent me from giving my own interpretation when it diverges from his. For the convenience of my readers I will reproduce here what WILAMOWITZ has made out of the original and, as the text of the *Persians* in the facsimile edition has incorporated more of the editor's suggestions than has the annotated edition, my friend Professor MILLER has kindly harmonized the two and corrected some slight errors of the press.

THE ΠΕΡΣΑΙ OF ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ.¹

- [σ]ὺν [ἐμ]βόλοισι γείτ[ονε]ς
 .. υ ἀντίαι
 πρι. [ἐ]νεχάρα-
 [ῥα]ν πο[σ]ὶ δὲ γε[ισθ]λογχο[ν] 40
 ὄγ-
 5 κωμ(α)] ἀμφέθεντ(ο) ὀδόντων.
 στ .. αι δὲ κυρτοί[σι] κρασὶν [ἀμ-
 φεστεμ]μέναι
 χεῖρας παρέσυρον ἐλατίνας.
 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν [ἐ]νθένδ(ε) [ἀπ]ροφάσ]ι- 45
 στος ἐπ[ιφ]έροιτο πλαγὰ
 10 ῥηξί[ζυ]νος, πάντες [ι]σ[αν] ἐ-
 πὶ [δ]υσμ[ενε]ὶς ἐνά[ν]ται·
 εἰ δ(ἐ) ἀντίτοιχος ἀκτ[ίς] πρ[οσ]ά[ξι]ει-
 εμ, πολυκρότο[ν] [ῥι]πα[ί]σι [τᾶ-
 χ α]
 πεύκας πάλιν ἐφέροντο,
 15 αἱ δὲ [περὶ π]ά[ν]τῃ γνῖα διαφέ-
 ρουσα[ι]
 [πλ]ευρὰς λι[νο]ζώστους ἐφαι-
 νον, τὰς [με]λάνδετον πτυχα]ίς
 σκηπτ[ὸν] ἐπεμβάλλ[ο]ντες ἀνε-
 χ[α]ίτιζον, αἱ δὲ πρα[ν]ές] ἐ-
 20 [κλίνοντο δέμ]ας ἀπηγλαῖ-
 σμέναι σῖδα[ρ]έ[ω]ι κράνει.
 ἴσος δὲ πυρὶ δαμ[ασί]φως
 Ἄρης] ἀγκυλένδετος
 μεθετο χερσίν, ἐν δ' ἐπιπτε γνίους,
 25 αἶθε[ροφόρητον σ]ῶμα διακραδαίνων.
 στερεοπαγῇ δ' ἐφέρετο φόνι-
 α [μό]λιβα π[ισσ]ά[εν]τά τε περί-
 βολα πυρὶ φλεγ[όμεν]α ἐν ἀπο-
 τομάσι βονδόροις.
 δφεσι δὲ] βίोटος ἐθέτε[ι(ο)] ἀδι-
 30 ν[δ]ς ὑπὸ τανυπτέροις χαλ-
 κόκρασι νευρε[πεντάτοις].
 σμαραγδοχαίτας δὲ πόν-
 τος ἄλοκα ναίους ἐφοι-
 νίσσето σταλα[γμοῖς].
 35 [κρ]αναγαῖ βοᾷ δὲ [συμ]μιγῆς κατεῖ-
 χεν.
 ὁμοῦ δὲ νάιος στρατὸς
- βάρβαρος ἀμαι[γ(α) αὐ]τ[ις] ἀν-
 τεφέρετ' ἐν ἰχ[θ]υ[σ]τεφέσει μαρ-
 μαροπ[τέρ]ο[ις] κόλποισιν [Ἄμ-
 φιτρίτ]ας· ἐνθα τοῖ τ[ις] Φρυγιο]-
 πέδιος ἀνὴρ, ἀμερο-
 δρόμοιο χώρας ἀναξ
 [π]λάκ' ὁ[μ]βρίαν ἀ[ρ]ῶ[ν] σκέ-
 λεσι]
 χ]ερσὶν τε παῖω[ν] ἐπλεῖ νησιώ-
 45 τας [ἀνέμοις] θεινόμε[νος]
 [κ ν μ α τ ο π λ ῆ ξ] [δ]ιμεξόδους
 μ[ατεῖω]ν.
 ἰσόρροπά τε παλενο[ν]—
 — — — — ηλ —
 — — — — ον [κ]άλει
 50 θ[αλάσ]σιον θεὸν πατέρα
 τ[ε] — — νο . . . φι — —
 — — — — κεπ — —
 — — — — λασσων — —
 — σπ . . τε — —
 55 — γαν . . ον — — α Περσάν
 εφασ . . ρ — —
 αντεκεκρατ νιν
 κελαι[ν] . . [ἀμ]βλὺν δ' ὦ[χ]ρον—
 — — — — ς κατ[εσ]-
 60 σφρα[γισμέν] στα—
 πεπα . . ολλ — —
 — — ντεκ . . τος . .
 νότον — —
 ε διαπαλεύων
 65 — — — — — πον βάσιμον . .
 . . . ν δίοδον
 ἐσμ[δ]ς [ἀπ]ειρος — — —
 φιναιστρ[ν] . . . [ἐ]λιχθεῖς
 — — — — — υλα — — φον
 70 [πν]εῦμα. [δ] | τε δὲ τᾷ λείποιεν
 αὐ-
 ραι, τᾷδ' ἐπεισέπιπτεν ἀ-
 φρώδης ἀβαχχίωτος ὁμ-
 βρος, εἰς δὲ τρῶφιμον ἄγγος
 ἐχειτ(ο). ἐπεὶ δ(ἐ) ἀμβόλιμος ἄλ-
 75 μα στόματος ὑπερέθνεν,

¹ Spaced type is used to indicate the restorations found only in the facsimile edition.

ὄξυπαρاندήτωι
 φωνᾷ παρακόπωι
 τε δόξαι φρενῶν
 κατακορής ἀπείλει,
 80 γόμοις ἐμπρίων
 μιμούμενος, λυμεῶ-
 νι σώματος θαλάσσαι·
 “ἦδη θρασεῖα καὶ πάρος
 λάβρον αὐχέν(α) ἔσχες ἐμ
 85 πέδαι καταζευχθεῖσα λινοδέτω^ι
 τεόν,
 νῦν δέ σ(ε) ἀναταράξει
 ἐμὸς ἀναξ, ἐμός,
 πείκασιν ὀριγόνουσιν, ἐγ-
 κλήμει δὲ πεδία πλόιμα νομάσιν
 αὐγαῖς,
 90 οἰστρομανὲς παλεομί-
 σημ(α) ἀπιστόν τ(ε) ἀγκάλι-
 σμα κλυσιδρομάδος αἶρας.”
 φάτ(ο) ἀσθματι στρευνόμενος,
 βλοσυρὰν δ(ἐ) ἐξέβαλλεν
 95 ἄχραν, ἐπαν(α)ερευνόμενος
 στόματι βρύχιον ἄλμαν.
 φνυγαῖ δὲ πάλιν ἵετο Πέρ-
 σης στρατὸς ᾧ βάρβαρος ἔπι-
 σπέρχων.
 ἄλλα δ(ἐ) ἄλλαν θραῦεν σύρτις,
 100 μακρανχευόπλους
 χειρῶν δ(ἐ) ἐγβαλλον ὀρείους
 πόδας ναός. στόματος
 δ’ ἐξήλλοντο μαρμαροφεγ-
 γεῖς παῖδες συγκρουόμενοι·
 105 κατὰστρος δὲ πόντος
 ἐγ λιποπνός ψυχοστερέσιν
 ἐγάργαυρε σώμασιν,
 ἐβρίοντο δ(ἐ) αἰόνες.
 [οἶ] δ’ ἐπ’ ἀκταῖς ἐνάλοις
 110 ἥμενοι γυμνοπαγεῖς
 αὐταῖ τε καὶ δακρυ-
 σταγεῖ [γ]ῶ[ω] [ι] στερνοκτύποι
 γοηταὶ θρηνώδει κατεῖχοντ’ ὀδυρμῶι,
 ἅμα δὲ [γᾶν] πατρίαν ἐπανε-
 115 κα[λ]ῶ[ν]τ(ο) “ἰὼ Μῦσαι
 δεινροθέθιραι πτυχαί,
 [ρύσ]ασθὲ μ’ ἐνθέν[δ](ε), ἵν’ ἀή-
 ταις φερόμεθ(α)· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι ποτ’ ἀ-
 μὸν [σῶ]μα δέξεται [κόν]ις.

120 κ[ῡρ]εγ γὰρ χερὶ πα[λ]ε[ο]νυμ-
 φαγόνον [ᾗ]βατ[ον] ἄντρον
 ο διαστακαπε . . .
 . . . δονεῖτο βαθύ[τ]ερον πόντοιο
 τ[ῆ]ρμ[α].
 ἀπεχέ μ’, ἀχί μο[ι] κ[ι]α[τᾶ]
 125 πλόιμον Ἑλλαν εὐ[παγ]ῇ στέγην
 ἔδειμε
 [τ]η[λετ]ελεοπόρον ἐμὸς
 δεσπότης, οὐ γὰρ ἄν Τμῶ[λον] οὐδ(ἐ)
 ἄστν Λυδὸν [λι]πὼν Σάρδεων
 ἦλθον [ῥ]ε[λλαν] ἀπέρξων Ἀ[ρη].
 130 νῦν δὲ πᾶι τις δυσέκφευκ[τ]ον εὐ-
 ρη | γλυκεῖαν μόρον καταφυγῇ;
 Ἰλιοπόρος κακῶν λυαί-
 α μόνα γένοιτ’ ἂν,
 εἰ δυνατὰ πρὸς μελαμπεταλο-
 135 χίτωνα Μαρτὸς οὐρεῖ-
 ας δεσπόσυνα γόνυα πεσεῖν,
 εὐάλεονος τε χεῖρας ἀμφέβαλλον
 λῦσον, χρυσοπλόκαμε θεᾷ
 Μᾶτερ ἰκνοῦμαι,
 140 ἐμὸν ἐμὸν αἶωνα δυσέκ-
 φευκτον, ἐπεὶ με
 αὐτῆκα λαίμοτῶμαι τις ἀποίσεται
 ἐνθάδε μήστορι σιδάρωι,
 ἢ κατακνυμοτακεῖς ναυσιφθόροι
 145 αὔραι νυκτιπαγεῖ βορέαι δια-
 ραίσονται· περὶ γὰρ κλύδων
 ἄγριος ἀνέρρηξεν ἅπαγ
 γυῖων εἶδος ὑφαντόν,
 ἐνθα κείσομαι οἰκτρὸς ὀρ-
 150 νίθων ἐθνεσιν ὠμοβρῶσι θοινά.”
 Τοιάδ(ε) ὀδυρόμενοι κατεδάκρουν.
 ἐπεὶ δὲ τις λαβὼν ἄγιοι
 πολυβότων Κελαινᾶν
 οἰκῆτορ(α) ὀρφανὸν μαχᾶν
 155 σιδαρῶκος Ἑλλαν,
 ἀγεγ κόμης ἐπισπᾶσας,
 ὃ δ’ ἄμφι γόνυασι περιπλεκεῖς
 ἐλίσσεται(ο) Ἑλλάδ’ ἐμπλέκων
 Ἀσιάδι φωνᾷ, διάτορον
 160 σφραγιδα θραῦον στόματος,
 Ἰάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξιχνεύων.
 “ἐγὼ μοί σοι κῶς καὶ τί πρᾶγμ(α),
 αὐτὶς οὐδ’ ἄμ’ ἔλθω.
 καὶ νῦν ἐμὸς δεσπότης

- 165 δεῦρό μ' ἐνθάδ' ἦξε,
τὰ λοιπὰ δ' οὐκέτι πάτερ, οὐ-
κέτι μάχεσθ' αὐτὶς ἐνθάδ' ἔρχω,
ἀλλὰ κάθω·
ἐγὼ σοι μὴ δεῦρ', ἐγὼ
- 170 κείσε παρὰ Σάρδι, παρὰ
Σοῦς(α), Ἀγβάτανα ναίων.
Ἄρτιμιν, ἐμὸς μέγας θεός,
παρ' Ἐφεσον φυλάξει."
Οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ παλίμπορον φυ-
- 175 γὴν ἔθεντο ταχύπορον,
αὐτίκα μὲν ἀμφιστόμους
ἄκοντας ἐχ' χερῶν ἐρι-
πτον, δρύπτετο δὲ πρόσωπον ὀνυ-
χι, Περσίδα στολὴν περὶ
- 180 στέρνοισι ἔρεικον εὐνῆν,
σύντονος δ(ἐ) ἀρμόζετο
Ἀσιᾶς οἰωγὰ,
πολυστόνως κτύπει δὲ πᾶ-
σα βασιλεύς πανήγυριν
- 185 φόβωι, τὸ μέλλον εἰσορώμενοι πά-
θος.
καὶ παλινπύρευντον ὡς ἔσ-
εἶδε | βασιλεὺς εἰς φυγὴν ὀρ-
μῶντα παμμυγῇ στρατόν,
γονυπετῆς αἰκίζε σώμα,
- 190 φάτο δὲ κυμαίνων τύχαισιν
"Ἴδω κατασκαφαὶ δόμων
σεῖρμαί τε νῆες Ἑλλανίδες,
αἱ κατὰ μὲν ἡλικ(α) ὀλέσασ(ε) ἡ-
βαν νέων πολύανδρον,
- 195 νᾶες δὲ — — —
οὐκ(ι) ὀπισσοπόρευτον ἄ-
ξουσιν, πυρὸς δ' αἰθαλόεμ
μένος ἄγρῳι σώματι φλέ-
ξει, σπονδέντα δ(ἐ) ἄλγη
- 200 ἔσται Περσίδι χώραι.
ὦ βαρεῖα συμφορά,
ἃ μ' ἐς Ἑλλάδ(α) ἤγαγες.
ἀλλ' ἴτε μηκέτι μέλλετε ζεύγνυτε
μὲν τετράορον ἵππων
- 205 ὄχημ(α), οἱ δ(ἐ) ἀνὰριθμον ὀλ-
βον φορεῖτ' ἐπ' ἀπήνας,
πίμπρατε δὲ σπηνάς,
μηδέ τις ἡμετέρον
γένειτ(ο) δνησις αὐτοῖσι πλούτου."
- 210 οἱ δὲ τρόπαια στησάμενοι, Διὸς
ἀγνότατον τέμενος, Παιᾶνα
ἐκελάδησαν, ἱήιον
ἄνακτα, σύμμετροι δ' ἐπεκτύπεον
ποδῶν
ὑψικρότοις χορεΐαις.
- 215 Ἀλλ' ὦ χρυσοκίθαριν ἀέ-
ξων μούσαν νεοτευχῇ
ἐμοῖς ἐλθ(ἐ) ἐπικούρος ὕ-
μνοις ἱήε Παιᾶν·
ὁ γάρ μ' εὐγενέτας μακραί-
ων Σπάρτας μέγας ἀγεμῶν,
- 220 βρύων ἀνθεσιν ἦβας,
δονεῖ λαὸς ἐπιφλέγων
ἐλαῖ τ(ε) αἰθοπι μῶμωι,
ὅτι παλαιότεραν νέους
- 225 ὕμνοις μούσαν ἀτιμῶ.
ἐγὼ δ(ἐ) οὔτε νέον τιν(ᾶ) οὐ-
τε γεραὸν οὔτ(ε) ἰσθήβαν
εἰργω τῶνδ' ἐκάς ὕμνων,
τοὺς δὲ μουσopaλαιολύ-
- 230 μας, τούτους δ(ἐ) ἀπερύκω,
λωβητῆρας αἰοιδᾶν
κηρίκων λυγνμακροφῶ-
νων τείνοντας ἰνύας.
πρῶτος ποικιλόμουνσον Ὀρ-
φεὺς χέλυν ἐτέκνωσεν,
- 235 νιδὸς Καλλιόπας Πιερίας ἐπι.
Τέρπανδρος δ' ἐπὶ τῷ δέκα
ζεῦξε μούσαν ἐν ὠδαῖς·
Λέσβος δ(ἐ) Διολία νῦν Ἀν-
τίσσαι γείνατο κλεινόν·
- 240 νῦν δὲ Τιμόθεος μέτροις
ῥυθμοῖς τ(ε) ἐνδεκακρονμάτοις
κίθαριν ἐξανατέλλει,
θησαυρὸν πολύνυμον οἰ-
ξας Μουσᾶν θαλαμεντόν·
- 245 Μίλητος δὲ πόλις νῦν ἁ
θρέψας, ἃ | δυωδεκατε-
χέος λαοῦ πρωτέος ἐξ Ἀχαιῶν.
Ἀλλ' ἐκαταβόλε Πύθι', ἀγνάν
- 250 ἐλθοις τάνδε πόλιν σὺν ὀλ-
βωι, πέμπων ἀπήμονι λα-
ῶι τῶιδ' εἰρήναν
θάλλονσαν εἰνομίαι.

The description of the Battle of Salamis in the Persians of Timotheos has no historical warrant such as one imagines in the Persians of Aischylos. It is doubtless accommodated to the normal sea-fight of Timotheos' time, the normal sea-fight of the Peloponnesian War. There was no more antiquarianism about Timotheos than there was about Pindar, who uses the ἄγκυραι of his day and not the εὐναί of the Argonautic age (P. 4, 24). In order to understand Timotheos we must read Thukydides and Xenophon and the other authorities for that period, and, as the Confederates reintroduced antique methods, not to say, antique valor, a man of my time is occasionally reminded of the performances of the Merrimac in the spring of 1862. So much for the time; and as for the place, the harbor of Syracuse will serve as well as the Bay of Salamis. The local touches amount to very little. 'Enwreathed with strings of fishes' will answer for Hampton Roads, and Norway is full of bays with rocky headlands 'that jut out like wings'. Technical terms are set at naught and the poet's only aim is to say the ordinary things in an extraordinary way, so that we are really grateful to him for using so familiar a word as ἐμβόλοισι (v. 1), which Pindar did not disdain. Elsewhere the homely ram is an ἀντίτοιχος ἀκρίς (v. 12), a σιδάρεον κράνος (v. 21). In fact, the ram seems to be omnipresent. WILAMOWITZ recognizes it in the σκηπτός of v. 18, and I am surprised that he does not consider the puzzling γε . . . λογχο . . . ὀδόντων (v. 4 sq.) another avatar of the ram. At least, one of the prows figured in Baumeister (No. 1691) might be thought to look like WILAMOWITZ'S 'toothed cornice.' The oars are nowhere oars. Now they are 'feet,' πόδες (v. 4), for the ship 'walks the waters like a thing of life' and the true nautical πούς or 'sheet' is banished. Anon the oars are χεῖρες ἐλάτναι (v. 7) for the ship is a swimmer as well and the true σιδηραὶ χεῖρες or 'grappling irons' are nowhere to be seen. The same oars are πόδες again, this time ὄρειοι πόδες (v. 102) and in v. 88 they are πῦναι ὀρίγονοι. In point of fact, we encounter from the start a series of γρίφοι such as Greek comedy delights in; and inasmuch as a great deal of our knowledge of antique nauticalities is guesswork, we have riddle within riddle and an Oedipus like WILAMOWITZ will be welcome to those who hate conundrums.

Still, even unaided by restorations, we can make out something of the course of events. So v. 8 there can be very little doubt that a front attack is delivered, ship against ship, ἀντίπρωροι ἐμβαλλόμεναι (Thuk. 7, 34, 5) ram against ram, man against man.—The indications of boarding are not very plain, for this is not the way in which hostile ships are usually boarded, but for all that, we must consider WILAMOWITZ'S paraphrase as a possibility: πάντες οἱ ναῦται ἐπὶ τὴν πολεμίαν ναῦν ἐπιδιαβῆναι ἐπειρῶντο.—A side attack is threatened and the opposing ships back water. We have a

vision of ships that go apart or drift apart and show their linen girths; of a 'thunderbolt,' ram or haply dolphin, that plunges into the hold with a blow that makes the vessels toss the head, that makes them capsize. We have a vision of ships sinking by the prow or haply turning over on the side, shorn of the glory of their oarage by the iron skull-cap of the ram.—*ὑπὸ τῆς σιδηρᾶς . . . κεφαλῆς ἀποβαλοῦσαι*, says the paraphrast, but there is no causal nexus and *ἀποβεβληγκύαι* would have been nearer the mark.—Darts are sped like fire or lightning and fall, quivering as they fly, into the hull, into the hold of the ship. Fiery balls are sent into the enemy's vessels and many a life is lost beneath the shower of arrows. The green-haired sea is em-purpled by the droppings of the ships, whether sparks of fire or gouts of blood. Yelling and shouting rule the scene (v. 35).—'Green-haired' is a rare epithet for the antique sea. Green, thinks W., is the complementary color to the red sparks. *ἐφ'οὐνίσ-σεν*ο of blood does not need a chromatic commentary.¹

The barbaric fleet holds on its course to meet the enemy in the bay, a fishy bay, a rocky bay.—*ἰχθυ(σ)στεφείσι*, if rightly restored, is little more than *ἰχθυόεσι*. The latter part of compounds is often almost otiose and must not be pressed.—Suddenly a man of the plain appears,—a Phrygian, says the paraphrast, but we have one Phrygian below and this man, for aught we know, may be a Philistine, for the Philistines were emphatically men of the plain, as are their modern namesakes. Well, Phrygian or Philistine, he appears swimming for his life, a continental become an islander, and tries to get out of the turmoil. Soon lost amid the wreckage of the text, he emerges again to eject the salt water he is forced to swallow and gives Timotheos an opportunity to glorify what some superfine writers of our day call by the grand old name of 'parbreak'. And as he vomits, he reviles the sea in high-pitched tone and maddened mood, grinning defiance at her whom his lord had once bound and will yet lash with his oars and control with his eye (Ps. 32, 8: I will guide thee with mine eye). And now the Persian fleet is in full flight and the vessels crash into each other in their mad swirl and 'knock the feet of the ships out of the hands of the rowers', and the gleaming teeth—the rowlocks—fly out of the mouth, out of the red gunwale (*χείλος*) of the vessel (v. 104).—We breathe more freely and thank Diels for solving the puzzle. *σκαλμός*, it seems, was too commonplace a word for Timotheos, but seven years ago it thrilled me to hear it still used in Greek waters.—The sea swarms with constellations of bodies that have lost the breath of life

¹In solchem Zusammenhange kann schwerlich etwas anders gemeint sein als das von den Schiffen ins Meer strömende ("tropfende") Menschenblut.—DANIELSSON, p. 13.

(unless one makes a new word and reads *κατάστροπος*, and combines it with *ἐγ λιποπνότης*, as Professor MILLER has suggested, cf. v. 70), and the shores are loaded down therewith. The stranded survivors beat upon their breasts and fill the air with lamentations calling upon the wooded vales of Mysia to save them, deploring the lack of fit burial, yearning for the sight of the bridge that brought them far from their native land. There can be but one redeemer, the Great Mother, nay, could have been. Too late! Too late! And yet there is an urgent appeal for salvation, followed by a gloomy vision of death by the sword, by the wild winds, by the wild waves, and the end—to be devoured by the fowls of the air (v. 150).

A comic scene ensues. A man from Kelainai is fished up by the hair of his head, embraces the knees of his captor and breaks silence in broken Greek, broken past mending at first but his meaning gets plainer as he goes on. 'I—to me—to thee—how?—and—what matter? It is my master that brought me hither. Never, great father, will I come to fight thee again. I will stay peaceably at home, Sardis, Susa, Ecbatana. Great is Diana of the Ephesians. He, she, it will be my protector.'—One's memory goes back to the Anabasis, that bugbear of schoolboys, and to Kelainai, the inhabited city, great and prosperous, where Cyrus had a palace and a park full of wild beasts, and to the river Marsyas, five and twenty feet broad, and to Apollo's luckless rival. One wonders whether Timotheos had a special spite against Kelainai above all the towns of Phrygia.—Of course, on WILAMOWITZ'S theory the mountain Phrygian is an offset against the *Φρυγοπέδιος* of v. 40 and the Philistine's chances are reduced to nothing, in fact, never did amount to anything; and I make the *amende honorable* to those Philistines who thought otherwise. As the iterative optative shows, *ἐπεὶ* (= *ὅποτε*) *δέ τις λαβὼν ἄγοι*, this Kelainite is only one of a succession of captives, and, apart from the language, there could be nothing more farcical than this fishing scene in which barbarian after barbarian is hauled up by the hair of his head, the long hair so characteristic of the enemy. It is the comic side of the *βαθυχαυτεῖς Μῆδος* of Aischylos. The Kelainite is the spokesman for reasons best known to Timotheos, but we must imagine the other captives falling in at the end and saying, 'I live by (= in) Sardis, I by Susa, I by Ecbatana' (v. 170).

Meantime, the suite of the King drop their javelins and tear their faces with their nails, rend their garments and intone in unison an Asiatic lament. About the King there gathers a

groaning crowd, and the King himself, when he sees his fleet fleeing in wild disarray, falls on his knees, does despite to his body, and bewails the desolation of his house, the loss of the flower of his men, whom he shall never lead back. Fierce flames of fire shall devour them and groans and anguish be the lot of Persia. An evil day it was that brought him to Greece. No more delay. Yoke the chariot. Pile the uncounted treasure on the wains. Burn the tents that those people may get no good out of our wealth. But the Greeks set up a trophy in honour of Zeus and raise a song of triumph to Apollo and dance a lilting dance of victory. Such is the substance of the ὀμφαλός, the narrative.

The σφραγίς, in which the poet sets the seal to his work, begins with an appeal to Apollo, whom he beseeches to favor his new-fashioned song, his μούσαν νεοτευχῇ. Wherein that innovation consisted does not concern us just now. The claim of novelty is the main thing poetically and we are aware of it. It is as old as Homer and Hesiod. It was old when Pindar bragged of his νεοσίγαλος τρόπος. Aristophanes prides himself on the daring novelty of ending a comedy with a dance and Eupolis chides his detractors as does Timotheos. We are familiar with the 'Nullius ante trita solo' of Lucretius, with Milton's 'Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme' and Platen's 'Frei steht die Folge jedem. Ich fliege voran'. We wax as tired of epoch-making poets as of epoch-making grammarians and turn to ask, What are we to say of this great discovery?

After all, the disillusion as to 'old Timotheos' is not very startling. Athenaeus tells slighting stories about him, and the diction of the few fragments previously known has been pronounced 'vapid and contorted'. Will that verdict be changed? To be sure, the vapidness is not so evident at first, when one takes in eagerly the unfamiliar vintage. But of the contortion there can be little question. To be frank, no adult person who is fairly familiar with Greek poetry will be carried away with this specimen of the poetic power of Timotheos. Somehow the word νόμος has always exercised an imposing effect even on scholars. They read into its early occurrences all the majesty we ascribe to Law; and they have a respect for the musical νόμος that they would not have for 'tune'. So the Terpanthian νόμος with its seven parts was likened to the seven lamps of the golden candlestick; and once upon a time the Pindaric student that did not recognize the Terpanthian νόμος in the Epinikian Odes (Pindar I. E. xlix) was under the same condemnation that made an end of Uzzah, who took hold of the ark of the Lord. For my part, the first impression made by the κιθαρωδικός

νόμος on my irreverent mind was comic rather than otherwise, and even the speech of the Shah with its impatient present imperatives reminded me of a similar cumulation in the Acharnians (S. C. G. § 405), whereas it ought to have reminded me of Aischyl. P. V. 56 foll. For this happens to be the Aristophanic year in my cycle, and, though the illustrious editor to whom we owe this new debt of gratitude and admiration, repeatedly rebukes in advance any semblance of levity, any cheap fun at the expense of Timotheos, my environment is too much for me. Nor am I wholly without defence. The easiest approach to this Akropolis of poetry, as to the real Akropolis, lies through the deme of Kydathenaion, the deme of Aristophanes. Nay, Köhler and Wilamowitz himself think that Kydathenaion and Akropolis are one; and those who take the aesthetics of Aristophanes so seriously, ought not to complain of the appeal to his decision here. Again we hear the rapid notes of the shivering, not to say frosty, poet who hails the founding of Nephelokokkygia. Again we breathe the atmosphere of the mock lyrics of the Birds, of the Frogs; and the triple compounds, *πρόσθε λέων, σπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα*, remind us of the cockinesses, the 'horse-cockinesses' of Aristophanes' comic fabrications, for in this regard the dithyramb at its worst was not worse than the *κιθαρωδικὸς νόμος* of Timotheos. *μελαμπεταλοχίτων*, to cite no other example, belongs to the same poetical wardrobe as *σκοτοδασυπικνύθριξ*. Designedly comic is the figure of the barbarian suppliant, who furnishes a pendant to the *Δατισμός* of the Peace (v. 289) and recalls the Scythian archer of the Thesmophoriazusae. What would one not give for a dialogue between the lover of Artamuxia and the Asiatic Parolles of Timotheos. It would be as good as a discussion between Dr. Caius and Sir Hugh Evans. Of the metres I must renounce any judgment. I have no hope of reweaving myself, as old Lobeck said when he was urged to study Sanskrit, and as one who followed Westphal and Schmidt a generation ago into what was then the Celestial City and is now considered the Fool's Paradise of symmetry, as one who refused to obey the voice of Hephaestion and made merry over Dindorf's *olla podrida* of Greek metres, I feel that my best course is to keep silent about the lilting measures of Timotheos lest I be guilty of a return to the once familiar name of logaedic.

The poem is lively enough. The *κιθαρωδικὸς νόμος* must have been a law unto itself in the blending of the different departments of literature, and I should find it very hard to register the syntactical phenomena of Timotheos under any of the stylistic categories recognized in my Greek Syntax. But when I turn to consult my oracle, I find that there are no departments of literature left; and, seated high on the ruins of the Persians, WILAMOWITZ

laughs to scorn the traditional division into epic, lyric and dramatic. 'Wer von griechischer Poesie irgend was verstehen will, muss die allerdings überhaupt schlechthin unbrauchbare Dreiteilung der Schulästhetik in Epik, Lyrik, Dramatik fahren lassen' (p. 105). This is sad news for me. I listened with resignation when the great scholar intoned my favorite dirge, τὸ μηδὲν εἰς οὐδὲν ῥέπει (A. J. P. IX 84), over the Terpandrian controversy, but this is a more serious matter. 'Mir zerbricht mein frühes Leben Unter den Händen wie Knabenspielzeug'. However, I recognize the voice of fate and behold an omen, an *olwnós*, in the facsimile of Timotheos. Between the *ὀμφαλός* and the *σφραγίς* is a figure that looks more like a bird than anything else.¹ Can it be, can it be an ibis out of drawing? The bird would suit the Egyptian habitat, and Robinson Ellis has set forth its unlovely ways in his Prolegomena to Ovid's poem (A. J. P. III 89). Ibis-like, Timotheos has swallowed and digested all the departments of Greek poetry, epic, lyric, dramatic. But, honestly, I do not think that they have been improved by the process. To be sure, if we had the music, everything would be plain (A. J. P. XVI 394). But we haven't the music, and it is small comfort to beat time and hum τοῦ λαττοθρατ.

And here I might plead lack of space and content myself with the safe generalities in which I have indulged thus far, but it seems a duty to the younger generation of scholars to illustrate what I meant in the beginning of these desultory remarks by the virginity of the eye. Read the Oidipus of Sophokles and you can remember no other plot. Read WILAMOWITZ's reconstructions and it is with great difficulty that you can recall what the attitude of your mind was when you read the text independently.² Take one of the first connected passages that emerge from the wreck of the Persians (vv. 15-21) which WILAMOWITZ paraphrases thus: ὅσαι δὲ καταθρανισθεῖσάν τῶν κωπῶν (which, by the way, Professor More in the Independent renders as if it were τῶν καταθρανισθεῖσάν κωπῶν, to the utter demolition of the sense) δειροῦ κἀκέϊσε φέρονται τὰς πλευρὰς τὰς διαζώμασι περιειλημμένας ἐγύνουν, ταῦτα κεραυνῷ τρόπον τὸ ξμβολοῦ ἐναράττοντες ἀνέτρεπον ὥστε προνεύουσαι κατεδύνοντο, τὸ τῆς κατασκευῆς κάλλος ὑπὸ τῆς σιδηρᾶς τοῦ

¹ Es wird doch wohl ein zu einem Vogel stilisiertes Zeichen sein, das die Funktion der späteren Koronis erfüllt; ob es eine ist und eine Krähe vorstellen will, lasse ich dahingestellt; über diese Äusserlichkeit wird wohl noch viel geredet werden.—WILAMOWITZ, p. 8.

² These reproductions of my first impressions were partly in the hands of the printer, partly on the way thither, when, on the eighteenth of May, Professor BLOOMFIELD handed me an advance copy of DANIELSSON's *Zu den Persern des Timotheos* in the Upsala Eranos for 1903. Our interpretations coincide at a number of points, and their absolute independence may serve as an illustration of my thesis, the value of fresh vision.

πλήκτρον κεφαλῆς ἀποβαλοῦσαι. 'Es ward beschrieben', he says (p. 57), 'welche Folgen die verschiedenen Stösse hatten, wie das Schiff nach dem Verluste der Ruderreihe dem Feinde die wehrlose Seite bot, den Stoss erhielt, kenterte, mit dem Vordertheile voran sank'. This is very plausible. But let us examine the text in detail.

What is γυῖα? What is διαφέρουσαι? And what does γυῖα διαφέρουσαι mean? And remember above all that there is no *περὶ πάντη* in the papyrus. The γυῖα cannot be 'hands and feet.' It may be 'tiers' or 'wales' (compare the Pindaric *ὑψίγυιον ἄλσος* O. 5, 13), but the use of the word elsewhere points to the body of the ship, whether waist or hold. Lyric poetry like epic avoids the reflexive and prefers more concrete forms (Pind. P. 4, 173) and it requires no argumentation to show that γυῖα διαφέρουσαι is = διαφερόμεναι. But there is more than one διαφέρειν and in the absence of *περὶ πάντη* the uninstructed soul might have thought first of the meaning 'rend apart', might have thought first of γυῖα λέλυντο, might have translated γυῖα διαφέρουσαι into *δυστάμεναι* or haply *κεχηρνύαι*, might have remembered Vergil's fleet after a storm (Aen. 1, 122): *Laxis compagibus omnes | accipiunt inimicum imbrem* (our *ἄβαρρον ἀβαρχίων* v. 72) *rimaeque fatiscunt*. 'The shattered ships display their linen girths' and this may be due to the impact of the ever active ram. But WILAMOWITZ tells us that these girths were made visible by the shearing off of the oarage, but really, in the present state of controversy about the *διάζωμα* and the *ὑπόζωμα*, I am not prepared to say whether this explanation is even plausible. The sides of the vessels are clearly to be seen between the oars in all Baumeister's figured monuments; and one would have imagined these girths neatly covered up with planks except when repairs were hastily made as in Acts 27, 17: *βοηθείαις ἐχρῶντο ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον*. Next, what is the nature of the *σκηπτός*? Literally, it means 'thunderbolt' and though it is unfair to insist on a natural expression in Timotheos, a thunderbolt naturally falls and *ἐπεμβάλλοντες* leads one naturally to think of missiles projected from above and first of the familiar *δελφίνες μολύβδινοι*, for *δελφίς* is hog-fish and the Greeks call 'hog-fish of lead' what we call 'pigs of lead'. Surely no classical scholar will need to be referred for these *δελφίνες* to the scholiasts on Thuk. 7, 41 and Ar. Eq. 762. Now, conjecture for conjecture, is not *μολύβδινον* as good as *μελάνδετον*?¹ The next passage is still more puzzling. Accept the restored parts of *πρα[νές] ἐ[κλίνοντο δέμ]ας* and I am free to confess that untaught by WILAMO-

¹ So wird der Dichter nicht vom Rammstoss gesprochen haben; dagegen passt der Ausdruck vorzüglich auf den zerschmetternden Wurf des *δελφίς* genannten 'Fallklotzes'. Somit hätte man in V. 17 *τὰς* [δὲ und danach etwa z. B. *μολύβδινον πτυχαίρις* 'den bleiernen Wetterschlag' zu ergänzen.—DANIELSON, p. 13.

WITZ I should not have elicited from *πρανές* the meaning *προνεύουσαι κατεδύντο*. An *ὀρθή ναῦς* is a ship on even keel. The opposite is *ὑπτία* as in Soph. Antig. 717: *ὑπτίους κάτω | στρέψας τὸ λοιπὸν σέλμασιν ναυτίλλεται*. To be sure, with a human being *πρηνής* and *ὑπτιος* are opposed to each other, but starboard and port are symmetrical so that *πρανές* as the reverse of *ὀρθόν* may be equivalent to *ὑπτιον*, and uninstructed I should have fancied that *πρανές ἐκλίνοντο δέμας* meant that the ships were on their beam-ends. True, the pictorial sequence evoked by WILAMOWITZ is very satisfactory and he can cite for the second *αἱ δὲ* as referring to the subject of the preceding sentence such authorities as Herodotos and Xenophon. But this is not Attic syntax nor is it Timothean syntax (cf. vv. 157, 174, 205, 210) and one's first impression is in favor of rendering the second *αἱ δὲ*, 'yet others'; and 'yet others' would spoil the WILAMOWITZIAN sequence. And then *αἱ δὲ* stirs another question. Why should we not read with Professor MILLER *τὰς δὲ* and assume three sets of ships, ships with gaping sides, ships sinking under the crushing weight of the *δελφίς*, ships on their beam-ends?¹ Observe the parallelism of the three imperfects and the unnaturalness of the relative construction here.

The Persians of Timotheos is not high poetry, but it is at all events high-strung poetry, and the chords of our responsive lyre must be screwed up. Of the parts of the Terpandrian *νόμος* we have here the *ὀμφαλός* and the *σφραγίς*; and the *ὀμφαλός*, which carries the narrative, is fearfully corrugated and the interpreter must often do violence to his imagination. But Timotheos can be as simple as the most simple. There is nothing more direct in literature than the speech of the Shah, and if I dare mention syntax in a number that groans under syntax, the syntax of Timotheos is perfectly normal where it is not childishly simple, as it is in his tiresome *δέ—δέ—δέ* parataxis. There is one 'mixed condition', it is true. But it occurs in a highly emotional passage and can easily be defended, even if such shifts were not common in sentences of comparison. The speaker begins (v. 132) with something feasible and finds as he goes on that it is hopeless: *Ἰλισπόρος κακῶν λυαία μόνα γένοιτ' ἂν, εἰ δυνατὰ* (sc. *ἦν*) *πρὸς μελαμπεταλοχίτωνα Μαρτὸς οὐρέας δεσπόσυνα γόνата πεσεῖν, εὐωλένους τε χεῖρας ἀμφέβαλλον*. Cf. Eur. I. T. 447: *ἦδιστ' ἂν τήνδ' ἀγγελίαν δεξαίμεσθ'*, *Ἑλλάδος ἐκ γὰρ πλωτῆρων εἴ τις ἔβα*, the pathos of which is recognized by the editors. If, then, the ordinary interpretation gives a good sense, I do not see why we should resort to the strained, the violent, the obscure. The enraged swimmer, WILAMOWITZ'S [*Φρυγιο*] *πέδιος*, apostrophizes the sea (v. 90), as his *οἰστρομανές παλεομίσημα*, as his 'frantic pet

¹ Also ist auch das erste *αἱ δὲ* demonstrativ und drei Fälle des Verunglückens zu unterscheiden.—DANIELSSON, p. 12.

aversion', as the ἀπιστον ἀγκάλισμα αἶρας, as the 'faithless minion of the breeze'. Is this nonsense, as WILAMOWITZ would have us to believe? Fire and water are natural enemies—Ag. 650 f.: οὐτες ἔχθιστοι τὸ πρῖν, | πῦρ καὶ θάλασσα—but wind and wave are something more than alliterative allies. They are comrades, they are partners in mischief. The Greek, who loved the sea, was prone to put the blame on the winds, as we learn from Solon, ἐξ ἀνέμων δὲ θάλασσα ταρασσεται· ἦν δὲ τις αὐτὴν | μὴ κινῆ, πάντων ἐστὶ δίκαιοιότη; and Herodotos foists the same Greek sentiment on a Persian (7, 16), but here the two go together and are alike guilty. More commonly the wind (ἄνεμος) is the man and the sea (θάλασσα) is the woman. The winds are masculine, and woman and the sea have been one for ages. Why rattle citations? to use WILAMOWITZ'S phrase. But sometimes the sea is masculine. So in later times when Ὠκεανός, the river became Ὠκεανός, the Ocean. πόντος has an ἄρσιν κτύπος and αἶρα and θέλλα are feminine. In Timotheos both the mischief-makers are feminine, Rosalind and Celia. But, says WILAMOWITZ, the wind is not apostrophized. Of course not. It is the sea that is 'the hugging-piece of the breeze'. But the wind does not hug, says WILAMOWITZ. What of Boreas and Oreithyia in the Phaidros of Plato, what of Alkaios's Zephyros and Iris, what of Milton's Zephyr and Aurora? The winds not only visit, as Shakespeare has it, and caress and toy, but they hug—and worse; and as I write, my eye falls on Henley's 'Speed'. 'Speed', he sings, 'and the hug of God's winds. Speed and the play of God's airs'. WILAMOWITZ says that he cannot translate Timotheos; he can only paraphrase him into scholiastic Greek. Of course, when the master translator gives it up (A. J. P. XIII 517), where shall the mere botcher appear? And yet I venture to say that 'faithless minion of the breeze' is fairly comprehensible,¹ and at all events does not require an unheard-of syntactical juggle with the genitive such as Timotheos gives us no warrant for suspecting and such as WILAMOWITZ'S paraphrase postulates: προδοτικῶς με περιβάλλονσαν θάλασσαν μετ' αἶρας οὕτω ταχέως ἐπερχομένης ὥστε με κατακλύσαι.

In v. 159: διάτορον σφραγίδα θραύων στόματος, 'Ιάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξ-
 ιχνεύων WILAMOWITZ interprets the διάτορος σφραγίς στόματος as = τὸ
 εὖ ἐξάκουστον τοῦ στόματος σύμβολον (τὸ συνετὸν τοῦ λόγου). The 'clear
 stamp of the mouth' is 'distinct utterance' which is 'broken by
 this braiding of Greek with Asiatic speech.' But according to

¹ ἀγκάλισμά τινας heisst ja was jemand in die Arme nimmt und darin trägt, übertragen also, sein 'Hätschelkind, Liebling', wie Lykophron 308 der junge Troilos τερπνὸν ἀγκάλισμα συγγόνων genannt wird: und nichts ist natürlicher als die, wenn ich mich recht entsinne, auch der modernen Dichtung ganz geläufige Anschauung dass Wind und Welle Buhlen seien.—DANIELSSON, p. 19.

WILAMOWITZ Timotheos thought that this phrase needed explanation and so he added 'ἰάονα γλῶσσαν ἐξιχνεύων. This interpretation can hardly be called convincing. The σφραγὶς στόματος would naturally mean 'silence' which the barbarian breaks or crushes into penetrating utterance, διάτορον being used proleptically = ὥστε διάτορον εἶναι.¹ Tragic poetry is full of this figure and it would be impertinent to cite examples. Bruhn has collected a considerable number of them in his 'Anhang zu Sophokles' (pp. 5, 6) and others will be found in the Index to my Pindar. On this theory the man of Kelainai would match the Φρυγιοπέδιος ἀνὴρ in his ὀξυπαραυδίτῳ φωνῇ and that would be quite in the manner of Timotheos who is perpetually varying the same theme. For the use of σφραγίς, cf. Anth. P. 10, 42: ἀρρήτων ἐπέων γλώσση σφραγὶς ἐπικεῖσθω | κρείσσων γὰρ μύθων ἢ κτεάνων φυλακή.

Not being acquainted with the Phrygian language except so far as Kretschmer teaches it in his 'Einleitung', I am unable to criticize Timotheos's Phrygian Greek (v. 162). The first words: ἐγὼ μοί σοι κῶς καὶ τί πρᾶγμα(a) are rendered thus: ἔγωγε σός εἰμι· πῶς δέ; καὶ τί τὸ πρᾶγμα; μοι is puzzling. A barbarian who had heard ἐγῶμαι might readily make a crasis of ἐγὼ εἰμι and σοί for σός would be a very likely turn, if he had picked up his Greek from a Kolophonian acquaintance (A. J. P. XXIII 22). The next words are not so simple as they seem. The speaker is bewildered. He is feeling his way through the Ionic dialect and promptly loses it; for the vulgar Ionic κῶς is succeeded by the Attic πρᾶγμα, an inconsistency that may be set down to supreme art or else to a blunder of the scribe. Here WILAMOWITZ's paraphrase is not so helpful as usual: πῶς δέ; καὶ τί τὸ πρᾶγμα; the δέ is doubtless inserted in deference to the feelings of the imaginary paraphrast but the asyndeton is more dramatic; and the article does not help the situation, for τί τὸ πρᾶγμα, 'what's the matter'? is not a natural address in the circumstances. We expect some such question as that of the jailor at Philippi: τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν; and πρᾶγμα in the sense of *opus*, the wretched Kelainite might have learned from Herodotos. τί πρᾶγμα, therefore, is τί πρακτέον and this is the sense that the translator in the Independent has given it, regardless of the Greek paraphrase. 'What is to be done', 'what is wanted', 'what's your will'? One is reminded of Haimon's professed subservience to his father's will: πάτερ, σός εἰμι· καὶ σύ μοι γνώμας ἔχων χρηστὰς ἀπορβοῖς, αἷς ἔγωγ' ἐφέψομαι. Another solution, which had crossed my own mind, is suggested by Professor MILLER. The

¹ Den Siegel seines Mundes bemüht sich der Phryger zu durchbrechen, indem er so gut es eben gehen will ionisch zu sprechen versucht. διάτορος wird proleptisches Prädikativ sein.—DANIELSSON, p. 38.

remarks, but as his treatment is so radically different from mine it seemed best to append here a brief review of the results reached by him.

The text as constituted by Wilamowitz is as follows :

ὦ φανείς χάρμα μοι φίλον, ὅτε μ' ἡγάπας,
 ὅτε δόρατι πολεμῶι τὰν Φρυγῶν πόλιν ἐπόρθεις μόνα
 τὰμὰ κομίσαι θέλων λέχεα πάλιν εἰς πάτραν.
 νῦν δὲ μούναν μ' ἀφείς ἄλοχον, ἄστοργ', ἄπεις,
 ἦν Δαναΐδαν λόχος ἔμολεν < Ἀρήιος μέτα, >
 ἥς ἔνεκα παῖδα τὰν ἄγαμον εἶλ' Ἀρτεμις,
 τὸν σφάγιον Ἀγαμέμνονι.

Wilamowitz thinks that the verses were originally tetrameters, "denn", to use his own words, "in dem zweiten Verse, der jetzt ein Pentameter ist, steht ein sinnloses *μόνα*, und die Verderbnis ist stark." It is not apparent whether the remark "und die Verderbnis ist stark" is intended to apply to the whole fragment, or simply to the second verse. The former supposition would account for the presence, in the first verse, of the proceleusmaticus *φίλον ὅτε*, for, surely, one would hardly think of a *φίλον* and still less of an *ε* lengthened either before the *μ* or under the influence of the ictus. But to pass on to "sinnloses *μόνα*", why "sinnlos"? Helen imputes to Menelaus the desire of wishing to convey *her* (= τὰμὰ λέχεα) *alone* (*μόνα*) to his home. In other words *she* was his *sole* object; the *only desire* he had was to get *her* back home. We understand the thought better by applying the qualifier to the verb, the Greeks understood it quite as well with the qualifier attached to the object. There is no need of striking out, or of emending, the *μόνα*. In verse 5, W. agrees with me in supplying *μέτα*, but differs in the position accorded to it in the verse; and, instead of his metrically unpalatable *Ἀρήιος*, our conjecture shows a *γε*. In the last line, W. thinks of iambic verse, but states that even with the omission of the article this verse makes no sense, "oder was sollte der Dativ?" And yet, there is no serious difficulty about the dative. *σφάγιον* is in apposition with *παῖδα*, and *σφάγιον Ἀγαμέμνονι* means 'a victim, an offering, for Agamemnon, i. e. something that served as a victim, an offering, for Agamemnon, i. e. an object for Agamemnon to slaughter, offer'. *Ἀγαμέμνονι* is but an ordinary dative of the "person to or for whom". Of course, Iphigenia was not actually slaughtered by Agamemnon (Eur. I. T. 26 ff.), but, as Iphigenia herself says (vv. 175 ff.): *τηλῶσε γὰρ δὴ σᾶς ἀπενάσθην | πατρίδος καὶ ἐμᾶς, ἔνθα δοκῆμασι | κεῖμαι σφαχθεῖς ἂν τλάμων*. For the dative compare vv. 241 ff.: *ἤκουσιν εἰς γῆν . . . | . . . δίπτυχοι νεανίαι, | θεᾶ φίλον πρόσφαγμα καὶ θυτήριον | Ἀρτέμιδι*, and 209 ff.: *ἂν πρωτόγονον θάλος . . . | Ἰλίδας ἂν τλάμων κούρα | σφάγιον πατρώα λῶβα | καὶ θυμ' οὐκ εὐγάθητον | ἔτεκεν κτέ.*, and, indeed, the phrase *σφάγιον πατρώα λῶβα* of the latter passage was probably hovering in the mind

of the author of our fragment, the style of which is characterized by Wilamowitz as "ausgeleierter tragischer Stil".

For my view of the rhythmical composition, compare Aristophanes, *Acharn.* 665-675 = 692-701. The ode and antode, which are paeonic, comprise four periods each. The first period consists of a paeonic hexameter (= 2 trimeters), the second period is an octameter, the third is composed of two tetrameters, and in the fourth there is a return to the hexameter (= 2 trimeters), with a trimeter following. Compare also Pax, 354-360 = 592-600 and *ibid.* 393-399, in each of which passages a paeonic hexameter is followed by a trochaic tetrameter, which is, in turn, succeeded by another paeonic hexameter, plus a trimeter. While, of course, none of the passages above cited, is the exact parallel of ours, they all show a grouping of cola of three feet around cola of four feet and they afford ample warrant for the rhythmical structure presented by me. It would appear, then, that our fragment is not nearly so corrupt as Wilamowitz would have us believe, and by supplying the words *γε μέτα* after *ἦν* and removing the *τὸν* before *σφάγιον*, the first of the Tebtunis fragments is reduced to a state, which, from a critical, exegetical, syntactical and rhythmical point of view, seems unassailable.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY:

Dear Sir:—I shall be grateful if you will announce in your next number that I have undertaken to write and edit the "Life and Letters" of the late Prof. E. B. COWELL, of Cambridge, and that it will be published by Macmillan & Co. There are probably many admirers of my cousin and even pupils amongst your readers from whom I am anxious to obtain the loan of letters, and who would be willing and glad to lend them to help to make the life interesting and complete. I need not say that I will take great care of and return any papers with which I may be entrusted.

24 HARRINGTON GARDENS, LONDON, S. W.,
May 21, 1903.

GEORGE COWELL.